

REMARKS

Claims 44-83 are pending, with claims 44, 48, 50, 64, and 77 being independent. Claims 44, 48, 50, and 77 have been amended, and claims 79-83 have been added by this amendment. No new matter is being added.

Claims 44-78 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Navin-Chandra et al. (US Patent No. 6,275,820, and Navin hereinafter), in view of Schneider (US Patent No. 6,442,549). With respect to claims 44-63 and 77-78, Applicant has amended claims 44, 48, 50 and 77 to obviate the rejection. With respect to claims 64-76, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant provides rationales below, responding first to claims 44 and 50 (and dependents), then to claims 48 and 77 (and dependents), and then to claim 64 (and dependents).

Claims 44 and 50 (and dependents)

As amended, claim 44 recites a system for storing searchable content. A first electronic region includes text displayed by different web pages from different web sites and is populated by determining a number of times a web site is accessed by members of a web host and conditioning automatic scanning and storage of the text of the web site based upon whether the web site has been accessed a threshold number of times by the members of the web host. A second electronic region includes text displayed by different web pages from different web sites and is populated by automatically scanning and storing the text of a web site provided by a listing service that was not accessed the threshold number of times by members of the web host.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 44 because Navin-Chandra and Schneider, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest all features and limitations of claim 44. Specifically, Navin-Chandra and Schneider fail to describe or suggest a region of web page text that is "populated by determining a number of times a web site is accessed by members of a web host and automatically scanning and storing the text of the web site when the web site is accessed a threshold number of times by the members of the web host," as recited in claim 44.

The cited portion of Navin-Chandra describes web pages and search engines provided by information service providers to enable users to search for specific web pages. "Usually, information service providers build indices, or databases, of web page contents through automated algorithms" (Navin-Chandra, col. 2, lines 53-55). Such automated algorithms typically crawl the Internet, indiscriminately following links included in already visited web pages to arrive at additional web pages. Thereafter, a user provides search criteria specifying desired web pages, and the search criteria are matched against the web page contents included in the indices to identify appropriate search results. The search results are presented to the user to enable the user to access the web pages represented by the search results.

Although Navin-Chandra describes storing web pages for use in association with a search engine, Navin-Chandra fails to describe or suggest a region populated by text of web pages that are determined to have been accessed a threshold number of times by members of a web host. Therefore, the cited sections of Navin-Chandra fail to describe or suggest a region of web page text that is "populated by determining a number of times a web site is accessed by members of a web host and automatically scanning and storing the text of the web site when the web site is accessed a threshold number of times by the members of the web host," as recited in claim 44.

Schneider fails to remedy the noted shortcomings of Navin-Chandra, which may explain the lack of reliance by the Office Action on Schneider to demonstrate this missing limitation. Moreover, Navin-Chandra and Schneider, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest a region of web page text that is "populated by determining a number of times a web site is accessed by members of a web host and automatically scanning and storing the text of the web site when the web site is accessed a threshold number of times by the members of the web host," as recited in claim 44.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 44 and its dependent claims.

Similarly, claim 50 recites "conditioning automatic collection of content appearing on the web page based upon whether the web page has been accessed by a member of a web host." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of

claim 50, and its dependent claims, for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 44.

New claim 80, which depends from claim 50, recites “conditioning automatic collection of content appearing on the web page based upon whether a count of users that are provided with web access by the web host and that have accessed the web page exceeds a threshold number.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claim 80, for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 44 and 50.

Claims 48 and 77 (and dependents)

Claim 48 has been amended to clarify a feature believed allowable prior to amendment. As amended, claim 48 recites a method for performing a search to identify web sites that relate to a search term based on text within the web sites. At least one search term is received and compared with electronic information within at least one electronic information store to determine whether matches exist. The electronic information within the at least one electronic information store includes text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with the text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites. Results including at least one web site identifier are displayed based on the matches that are determined to exist.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 48 because Navin-Chandra and Schneider, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest all features and limitations of claim 48. Specifically, Navin-Chandra and Schneider fail to describe or suggest “at least one electronic information store [that] includes text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with the text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites,” as recited in claim 48.

As discussed above with respect to claim 44, Navin-Chandra describes indices of web page contents that are populated through execution of automated algorithms that typically crawl the Internet, indiscriminately following links included in already visited web pages to arrive at

additional web pages. The automated algorithm does not consider whether the visited web pages are "introductory pages displayed by different web pages from different web sites," as was recited in claim 48 prior to amendment, when including the visited web pages in the indices. Therefore, the portions of Navin-Chandra cited with respect to claim 44 fail to describe or suggest "at least one electronic information store [that] includes text of introductory pages displayed by different web pages from different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with the text of introductory pages displayed by different web pages from different web sites," as was recited in claim 48 prior to amendment.

Furthermore, the Office Action indicates that col. 7, lines 52-61 and col. 9, lines 22-31 of Navin-Chandra describes introductory pages. Col. 7, lines 52-61 of Navin-Chandra describes ordering search results provided by heterogeneous information sources for presentation. Col. 9, lines 22-31 of Navin-Chandra describes the quality of hits obtained when metasearching specific domains and how the relatively low quality necessitates re-ranking and re-summarizing the hits. Therefore, the sections of Navin-Chandra cited to describe introductory pages fail to describe or suggest "at least one electronic information store [that] includes text of introductory pages displayed by different web pages from different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with the text of introductory pages displayed by different web pages from different web sites," as was recited in claim 48 prior to amendment.

This feature from claim 48 has been amended for clarity to recite "at least one electronic information store [that] includes text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with the text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites." Because Navin-Chandra fails to describe or suggest the feature prior to amendment, Navin-Chandra more clearly fails to describe or suggest the feature as now amended for clarity.

Therefore, the cited sections of Navin-Chandra fail to describe or suggest "at least one electronic information store [that] includes text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search

term with the text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites,” as recited in claim 48.

Schneider fails to remedy the shortcomings of Navin-Chandra, which may explain the lack of reliance by the Office Action on Schneider to demonstrate this missing limitation. Consequently, Navin-Chandra and Schneider, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest “at least one electronic information store [that] includes text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with the text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites,” as recited in claim 48.

For at least the reasons discussed here and above with respect to claim 44, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 48 and its dependent claims.

Similarly, claim 77 describes “at least one electronic information store [that] includes text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites such that the instructions for comparing the search term comprise instructions for comparing the search term with the text of only pages displayed as introductory web pages by different web sites.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 77, and its dependent claims, for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 44 and 48.

Claim 64 (and dependents)

Claim 64 recites a method for performing a search to identify web sites that relate to a search term based on text within the web sites. At least one search term is received and compared with electronic information within at least one electronic information store to determine whether matches exist. The electronic information within the at least one electronic information store includes text displayed by different web pages from different web sites and titles, descriptions, and addresses of the different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with at least one of the text, the titles, the descriptions, and

the addresses of the web sites. Results including identifiers for several web sites are displayed based on the matches that are determined to exist. Identifiers for the several web sites are ranked based on whether the matches occur with at least one of the text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of the web sites.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 64 because Navin-Chandra and Schneider, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest all features and limitations of claim 64. Specifically, Navin-Chandra and Schneider fail to describe or suggest "at least one electronic information store [that] includes text displayed by different web pages from different web sites and titles, descriptions, and addresses of the different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with at least one of the text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of the web sites," as recited in claim 64.

In its discussion of claim 64, the Office Action refers to previously cited sections of Navin-Chandra. As described above, the previously cited sections describe indices of text of web pages for use by a search engine. Specifically, Navin-Chandra itself indicates that, "as described, these indices may be of the full text or only a brief synopsis of a web page's text" (Navin-Chandra, col. 2, lines 55-57). However, Navin-Chandra fails to describe or suggest the indices including titles, descriptions, and addresses of the web pages in addition to text.

Absent such disclosure, the cited sections of Navin-Chandra cannot be said to describe or suggest "at least one electronic information store [that] includes text displayed by different web pages from different web sites and titles, descriptions, and addresses of the different web sites such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with at least one of the text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of the web sites," as recited in claim 64.

Schneider fails to remedy the shortcomings of Navin-Chandra, which may explain the lack of reliance by the Office Action on Schneider to demonstrate this missing limitation. Consequently, Navin-Chandra and Schneider, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest "at least one electronic information store [that] includes text displayed by different web pages from different web sites and titles, descriptions, and addresses of the different web sites

such that comparing the search term comprises comparing the search term with at least one of the text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of the web sites," as recited in claim 64.

For at least the reasons discussed here and above with respect to claims 44 and 48, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 64 and its dependent claims.


Claim 75 and new claims 81-83 recite comparing a search term with at least one of the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of stored web sites, potentially in addition to the text of the web sites. Because Navin-Chandra and Schneider fail to describe or suggest "at least one electronic information store that includes ...the text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of the web sites," as recited in claim 64, Navin-Chandra and Schneider necessarily fail to describe or suggest comparing a search term with at least one of the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of the web page. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 75 and 81-83 for at least the reasons described here and above with respect to claim 64.

New claims 79-83 depend from claims 44, 50, and 64, which Applicant submits are in allowable form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 79-83.

No fees are believed to be due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/31/2005



W. Karl Renner
Reg. No. 41,265

PTO Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
40285637.doc